Serial No.: 10/720,073
Amendment and RCE dated: July 16, 2008
Response to Office Action mailed April 11, 2008

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-20 have been rejected. Claims 1-4, 7-8, 11, 13, 15, and 20 have been amended. Claims 2-4, 7, 11, and 15 have been amended solely to correct antecedent basis issues. In view of foregoing amendments and following remarks, the Applicants request allowance of the Application.

RESPONSE TO CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 3 and 15 are objected to because of an insufficient antecedent basis for the recited limitation "the device profile." Applicants have amended claims 3 and 15 to recite "the associated device profile," as recommended by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the objections to claims 3 and 15 be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 4 are objected to because of an insufficient antecedent basis for the recited limitation "the first mobile device." Applicants have amended claims 2 and 4 to recite "the mobile device". Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the objects to claims 2 and 4 be withdrawn.

Additionally, Applicants have amended claims 7 and 11 to correct minor antecedent basis issues.

CLAIMS 1-20 DEFINE OVER CHASMAN IN VIEW OF SHIELDS

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chasman et al., hereinafter ("Chasman"), US 2007/0180075, in view of Shields et al., hereinafter ("Shields"), US 2003/0225797.

Chasman generally discloses a system and method for version control that synchronizes objects in a master database and objects in a replicated database. *See* Chasman, Abstract. Shields generally discloses a system and method for selectively identifying the type of information that can be downloaded to the mobile device. *See* Shields, Abstract.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 8, 13, and 20 to clearly distinguish them from Chasman and Shields. For example, at a minimum, neither Chasman nor Shields teaches or suggests the use of a centralized descriptor file that stores a separate registry for each remote device, with each registry maintaining the application resources and configuration

Serial No.: 10/720,073
Amendment and RCE dated: July 16, 2008
Response to Office Action mailed April 11, 2008

parameters relating to a particular software application that are already installed on the remote device, or the querying of the descriptor file to determine whether a desired configuration parameter or application resource is already installed or configured on the remote device prior to installing or configuring the remote device.

Chasman lacks any disclosure or teaching of this centralized descriptor file. Chasman instead teaches that during synchronization, each update request sent from a remote device that seeks to update a business object stored in a replicated database is compared to a corresponding business object in a master database. *See* Chasman, paragraph [0024]. Such one-to-one comparisons are time consuming relative to the claimed method and system.

Shields also fails to teach or disclose the centralized descriptor file. Shields instead teaches the use of a profile database that identifies information of interest to a mobile device, such as supported file types. Consistent with the fact that Shields is concerned with email and email attachment synchronization, the profile database does not maintain what application resources and configuration parameters are already installed on a remote device. *See* Shields, paragraphs [0024]. Rather, the profile database concerns itself with storing data on what file types are supported such that only those emails and attachments of a supported file type will be downloaded to a remote device. Further, during synchronization, the user profile associated with the remote device and the device type of the remote device are used to determine what information can be downloaded to the remote device. In other words, Shields does not maintain a descriptor file that maintains what application resources and configuration parameters are already installed for each specific device. Instead, information to be downloaded is determined based on user profile and the type of device.

Therefore, Applicants assert that Chasman and Shields do not teach or suggest independent claim 1 as amended, and for at least all the same reasons also do not teach or suggest independent claims 8, 13, and 20. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claims 1, 8, 13, and 20, and claims 2-7, 9-12, and 14-19 which depend from those independent claims be withdrawn.

All outstanding rejections have been overcome. It is respectfully submitted that, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the application is in clear condition for allowance. Issuance of a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Serial No.: 10/720,073
Amendment and RCE dated: July 16, 2008
Response to Office Action mailed April 11, 2008

Although not believed necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

The Office is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 975-7500 to discuss any matter regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Date: <u>July 16, 2008</u>   <u>/Mark D. Yuan/</u>
                                                Mark D. Yuan
                                                (Registration No.: 57,312)

Kenyon & Kenyon LLP
333 West San Carlos Street, Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501